REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 15, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-19 were pending, and rejected claims 1-19. Claims 2, 16, 17 and 19 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claims have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-19 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTIONS

Claim 19 is objected to as it fails to further limit the claimed invention. Claim 19 has been made dependent from claim 18.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 has been made dependent from claim 18.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. Claim 16 has been amended in conformity with the Examiner's comments.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Luke, U.S. Patent No. 7,130,867. Luke discusses a file system that divides files into Information Components which are tagged area of a file that have text in common with what would logically be other files, but in the Luke invention are a single file. Whereas the present claims are directed to means of efficiently searching a group of documents.

Luke discusses the ability to search documents. Luke column 24 lines 22 states:

This has been implemented, in a first example embodiment, as a Microsoft Word

plug-in which extracts the user's search terms from a Word document and passes them to a DLL for publishing via the publish/subscribe engine. The results (see below) can then be **displayed within the document with a dialogue box enabling the user to publish the results via the publish/subscribe engine**. [Emphasis added]

While Luke discusses searching it does not teach or suggest "indicate said data of said plurality of documents to said user in a first display form and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as a second search condition in a following processing," as in claim 1. Luke does not teach or suggest further searching based on the results of a first search. There is no indication of a refined search. Therefore, Luke does not teach or suggest "extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user; and transforming said data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item into information to indicate said data of said documents to said user in a second display form specified by said user and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as a third search condition in a following processing, and outputting the transformed information," as in claim 1.

As to claim 2, nothing as disclosed or found teaches a degree of relevancy is calculated by words used in the documents. Therefore, Luke does not teach or suggest "a second form showing indications of said extracted documents, and segments between the indications, each said segment representing a degree of relevancy between said extracted documents, that is calculated by used words in said extracted documents," as in amended claim 2. Further claim 2, has been amended to recite "said method further comprises receiving, before said second transforming, information concerning said second display form specified by said user, wherein said second display form is selected from one of said first to fifth forms." Support for the amendment found on page 13 lines 4-8 and page 14 lines 21-31 of the Application. Luke fails to teach or suggest prior to a second transforming a manner in which to display the next form. Claims 17 and 19 have been amended in a similar manner.

As to claims 3, Luke discusses a system to reduce storage needs by combining like data into a single file. Luke therefore discusses a system where there are not multiple files, thus there is no need for files to be clustered. Therefore, Luke does not disclose "dividing said plurality of documents into clusters by using said data of said plurality of documents," as in claim 3.

As to claim 13, Luke as cited or found does not disclose that a document is a patent document. Therefore, Luke does not teach or suggest "a document included in said predetermined document group is a patent document, and said display item is either of

bibliographic information of said patent document and a used word in said patent document," as in claim 13.

Independent claim 16 and 18 are computer program and apparatus claims similar to method claim 1 and therefore have similar features. For at least the reasons stated above, Luke does not disclose the elements of claims 1, 16 and 18 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Lizuka, U.S. Patent No. 7,133,860. Lizuka discusses a method of displaying data by the relationship of words to documents. Nothing as cited or found in Lizuka discusses allowing the user to choose how data is displayed. Therefore, Lizuka does not teach or suggest "display item into information to indicate said data of said documents to said user in **a second display form specified by said user**," as in claims 1, 16 and 18 (emphasis added).

As argued above, claim 2, has been amended to recite "said method further comprises receiving, before said second transforming, information concerning said second display form specified by said user, wherein said second display form is selected from one of said first to fifth forms." Lizuka fails to teach or suggest prior to a second transforming a manner in which to display the next form.

As to claim 13, Lizuka as cited or found does not disclose the use of bibliographic information of a patent document. Therefore, Luke does not teach or suggest "a document included in said predetermined document group is a patent document, and said display item is either of bibliographic information of said patent document and a used word in said patent document," as in claim 13.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 16 and 18 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable Lizuka.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112. It is also submitted that claims 1-19 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501